

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-4 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claim 1 is amended. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-4 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Helber (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0165046 A1) in view of Cooper (U.S. Patent No. 5,938,545). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

In particular, Applicant asserts that neither Helber nor Cooper, individually or in combination, discloses or suggests a comparison circuit for comparing a portion of the first video signal assigned an address with a second video signal of an image set up by an image analyzing program to output a subsequent portion of the first video signal to the internal analysis processing circuit if the second video signal of the image set up by the image analyzing program and the portion of the first video signal assigned the address are the same or similar, as recited in independent claim 1.

The Office Action, on page 3 admits that Helber does not disclose or suggest a comparison circuit. However, the Office Action asserts that Cooper discloses this feature. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Cooper discloses in Fig. 4 and at col. 3, line 63 - col. 4, line 8 that an identification of a particular image sensing element 56 on planar image array 54 for each of video cameras 28 and 30 is determined by comparison of the camera's digital data bit-stream for one frame scan with the data bit-stream of a preceding frame scan. This allows the direction of the golf ball 14 with respect to video cameras 28 and 30 at positions P1 and P2 to be determined.

Nowhere does Cooper disclose or suggest a comparison circuit for comparing a portion of a first video signal assigned an address with a second video signal of an image set up by the image analyzing program to output a subsequent portion of the first video signal to the internal analysis processing circuit if the second video signal of the image set up by the

image analyzing program and the portion of the first video signal assigned the address are the same or similar. Therefore, independent claim 1 defines patentable subject matter. Claims 2-4 depend on independent claim 1, and therefore also define patentable subject matter.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-4 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

  
William P. Berridge  
Registration No. 30,024

Yong S. Choi  
Registration No. 43,324

WPB:YSC/gew

Date: October 18, 2004

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 19928**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

<p><b>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION</b> Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------